



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,662	03/24/2004	Vahit Hakan Hacigumus	SVL920030133US1	6512
22462 7590 06/27/2008 GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045				
EXAMINER				
DAVIS, ZACHARY A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2137				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/807,662

Applicant(s)

HACIGUMUS ET AL.

Examiner

Zachary A. Davis

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-854)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040503, 20040810, 20070417

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because it is not clear whether the two items labeled "intermediate results 118" in Figure 1 are necessarily the same. In particular, it appears that the results would be further processed after being sent from the server computer, from the description in the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not in narrative form but rather corresponds substantially to Claim 1. Further, the abstract is a single sentence fragment. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification contains minor typographical and other errors. For example, on page 6, line 16, it appears that "commodotization" is intended to read "commoditization". It appears a period should be added at the end of the sentence on page 7, line 9. In the description of Figure 1 at page 7, line 15-page 8, line 9, it appears that the various references to "intermediate results set 118" may not actually refer to the same results set, and if so, clarification should be made to differentiate between the various sets. On

page 13, line 5, the placement of the parentheses in the phrase “generating a (possibly super-set) of results” is generally unclear. On page 39, line 13, it appears that “that” is intended to read “than”.

Appropriate correction is required. The above is not intended as an exhaustive list of errors in the specification. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 14, 17, 30, 31, and 44 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 14, 30, and 44 each use numerals in parentheses for numbering a list of items. However, the use of numerals in parentheses is restricted to denoting reference numerals from the drawing figures.

Claims 17 and 31 each recite “encrypting data at client computer” in line 3. It appears that “a” should be inserted before “client”.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. Applicant is advised that should claim 15 be found allowable, claim 16 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two

claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 17-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 17-44 are directed to methods and software implementations of corresponding methods. However, these methods appear to be solely directed to abstract ideas without a clear practical application. The end result of the processes performed appears to be the production of "actual results". However, it is not clear from the claims or specification what these results actually encompass. It does not appear that the claimed "actual results" would cause a physical transformation. Further, it does not appear that the "actual results" constitute a useful, concrete, and tangible result that would constitute a practical application of the abstract idea. There is no particular use claimed or described for these "actual results", so they are not clearly useful. Further, these results would appear, at best, to be pure mathematical results, which is generally abstract and therefore not tangible. Additionally, without further definition of what the

Art Unit: 2137

"actual results" encompass, it is not possible to clearly determine whether the repeatable production of the same results would be possible, which would be required to render the results concrete. Therefore, because the claims are directed to abstract ideas without a clear practical application, the claims are non-statutory.

Further, Claims 31-44 are directed to an "article of manufacture embodying logic for performing computations". It appears that the logic could encompass software *per se*, which is functional descriptive material that is not tangibly embodied on a computer-readable medium. This is not statutory subject matter because software in and of itself does not constitute either a process or computer components that would have sufficient structure to constitute a machine or manufacture under 35 U.S.C. 101. See MPEP § 2106.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

A determination of a failure to comply with the enablement requirement is made considering the undue experimentation factors set forth in MPEP § 2164.01(a). In the present application, the factors that appear to weigh most heavily are the breadth of the claims (MPEP § 2164.08), the amount of direction provided by the inventor (MPEP § 2164.03), and the existence of working example (MPEP § 2164.02). Independent Claims 1, 15, 16, 17, and 31 each broadly recite the limitation "in order to produce actual results" or "producing actual results". Dependent Claims 9, 25, and 39 also recite the limitation "in order to produce actual results". These limitations constitute an extremely broad recitation of a description of results produced. However, there is nothing in the specification that suggests what might distinguish "actual" results from any other results that are produced. The only descriptions in the specification largely use the same language as is present in the claims. These descriptions clearly do not provide a working example, other than to suggest that the actual results are displayed to the user (page 8, line 9 of the specification). This indicates that there is little direction provided by the inventor and no clear working example. Combined with the broad recitations of the claims, this suggests that the enablement of the description is not commensurate in scope with the claims (MPEP § 2164.08) and that undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the disclosure (MPEP § 2164.06).

Claims not specifically referred to above are rejected due to their dependence on a rejected base claim.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 uses the pronoun "it" in lines 8 and 9. While it appears that the first use is intended to refer to the intermediate results set, it is not clear if the second use is also intended to refer to the intermediate results set. If pronouns are used, care must be taken to ensure that their antecedents are clear. Further, Claim 1 recites the limitation "to produce actual results" in lines 10-11. This is generally unclear, as it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results, such as the intermediate results set, or any other results of any of the functions performed by the claimed system. Further, there is nothing in the claims or specification that defines or distinguishes "actual results" from any other results. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 2 recites several additional functions (decrypting, performing operations, re-encrypting, and returning) that the system performs. However, it is not clear at what point (i.e. in what order) these operations are to be performed. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the intermediate results set" in line 2. Although there is only one intermediate results set explicitly referred to in Claim 1, it is operated upon several times within the claim, which would result in multiple intermediate results

sets, and therefore, it is not clear to which of these sets the limitation is intended to refer.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "different placements of the round-trip filtering operator" within execution plans. It is not clear exactly what is intended by the use of the term "placements"; it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an ordering, either temporal or spatial or otherwise, of the operator, or to another sort of placement. Further, the claim recites the limitation "optimizes placement"; however, there is no standard set forth with respect to which the optimization is performed. Thus, this is a relative term for which no basis or standard of comparison has been clearly set forth in the claims or specification. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the intermediate results set" in line 2. Although there is only one intermediate results set explicitly referred to in Claim 1, it is operated upon several times within the claim, which would result in multiple intermediate results sets, and therefore, it is not clear to which of these sets the limitation is intended to refer. Claim 9 also recites the limitation "in order to produce actual results". As described with respect to independent Claim 1, it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "different placements of the last-trip decryption operator" within execution plans. It is not clear exactly what is intended by the use of the term "placements"; it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an ordering, either temporal or spatial or otherwise, of the operator, or to another sort of placement. Further, the claim recites the limitation "optimizes placement"; however, there is no

standard set forth with respect to which the optimization is performed. Thus, this is a relative term for which no basis or standard of comparison has been clearly set forth in the claims or specification. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim 15 uses the pronoun "it" in line 6. While it appears that the first use is intended to refer to the intermediate results set, it is not clear if the second use is also intended to refer to the intermediate results set. If pronouns are used, care must be taken to ensure that their antecedents are clear. Further, Claim 15 recites the limitation "to produce actual results" in line 8. This is generally unclear, as it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results, such as the intermediate results set, or any other results of any of the functions performed by the claimed system. Further, there is nothing in the claims or specification that defines or distinguishes "actual results" from any other results. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 16 uses the pronoun "it" in line 6. While it appears that the first use is intended to refer to the intermediate results set, it is not clear if the second use is also intended to refer to the intermediate results set. If pronouns are used, care must be taken to ensure that their antecedents are clear. Further, Claim 16 recites the limitation "to produce actual results" in line 8. This is generally unclear, as it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results, such as the intermediate results set, or any other results of any of the functions performed by the claimed system. Further, there is nothing in the claims or specification that defines or distinguishes "actual results" from any other results. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 17 recites the limitation “the transferred intermediate results set” in line 13. It is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the intermediate results set transferred in line 7 or the one transferred in line 12. Further, Claim 17 recites the limitation “producing actual results” in line 17. This is generally unclear, as it is not clear how “actual results” are distinguished from any other results, such as the intermediate results sets, or any other results of any of the functions performed by the claimed system. Further, there is nothing in the claims or specification that defines or distinguishes “actual results” from any other results. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 18 recites several additional steps (decrypting, performing operations, re-encrypting, and returning) that the system performs. However, it is not clear at what point (i.e. in what order) these operations are to be performed. This renders the claim indefinite. Further, Claim 18 recites “the intermediate results set”; however, it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the first intermediate results set recited at lines 5-6 of Claim 17, the updated intermediate results set at line 10 of Claim 17, or the new intermediate results set at line 14 of Claim 17, for example.

Claim 22 recites “the intermediate results set”; however, it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the first intermediate results set recited at lines 5-6 of Claim 17, the updated intermediate results set at line 10 of Claim 17, or the new intermediate results set at line 14 of Claim 17, for example.

Claim 24 recites the limitation “different placements of the round-trip filtering operator” within execution plans. It is not clear exactly what is intended by the use of the term “placements”; it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an ordering, either

temporal or spatial or otherwise, of the operator, or to another sort of placement.

Further, the claim recites the limitation "optimizes placement"; however, there is no standard set forth with respect to which the optimization is performed. Thus, this is a relative term for which no basis or standard of comparison has been clearly set forth in the claims or specification. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim 25 recites "the intermediate results set"; however, it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the first intermediate results set recited at lines 5-6 of Claim 17, the updated intermediate results set at line 10 of Claim 17, or the new intermediate results set at line 14 of Claim 17, for example. Claim 25 also recites the limitation "in order to produce actual results". As described with respect to independent Claim 17, it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "different placements of the last-trip decryption operator" within execution plans. It is not clear exactly what is intended by the use of the term "placements"; it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an ordering, either temporal or spatial or otherwise, of the operator, or to another sort of placement. Further, the claim recites the limitation "optimizes placement"; however, there is no standard set forth with respect to which the optimization is performed. Thus, this is a relative term for which no basis or standard of comparison has been clearly set forth in the claims or specification. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the transferred intermediate results set" in line 13. It is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the intermediate results set transferred in line 7 or the one transferred in line 12. Further, Claim 31 recites the limitation

"producing actual results" in line 17. This is generally unclear, as it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results, such as the intermediate results sets, or any other results of any of the functions performed by the claimed system. Further, there is nothing in the claims or specification that defines or distinguishes "actual results" from any other results. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 32 recites several additional steps (decrypting, performing operations, re-encrypting, and returning) that the system performs. However, it is not clear at what point (i.e. in what order) these operations are to be performed. This renders the claim indefinite. Further, Claim 32 recites "the intermediate results set"; however, it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the first intermediate results set recited at lines 5-6 of Claim 31, the updated intermediate results set at line 10 of Claim 31, or the new intermediate results set at line 14 of Claim 31, for example.

Claim 36 recites "the intermediate results set"; however, it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the first intermediate results set recited at lines 5-6 of Claim 31, the updated intermediate results set at line 10 of Claim 31, or the new intermediate results set at line 14 of Claim 31, for example.

Claim 38 recites the limitation "different placements of the round-trip filtering operator" within execution plans. It is not clear exactly what is intended by the use of the term "placements"; it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an ordering, either temporal or spatial or otherwise, of the operator, or to another sort of placement. Further, the claim recites the limitation "optimizes placement"; however, there is no standard set forth with respect to which the optimization is performed. Thus, this is a

relative term for which no basis or standard of comparison has been clearly set forth in the claims or specification. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim 39 recites "the intermediate results set"; however, it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to the first intermediate results set recited at lines 5-6 of Claim 31, the updated intermediate results set at line 10 of Claim 31, or the new intermediate results set at line 14 of Claim 31, for example. Claim 39 also recites the limitation "in order to produce actual results". As described with respect to independent Claim 31, it is not clear how "actual results" are distinguished from any other results.

Claim 40 recites the limitation "different placements of the last-trip decryption operator" within execution plans. It is not clear exactly what is intended by the use of the term "placements"; it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an ordering, either temporal or spatial or otherwise, of the operator, or to another sort of placement. Further, the claim recites the limitation "optimizes placement"; however, there is no standard set forth with respect to which the optimization is performed. Thus, this is a relative term for which no basis or standard of comparison has been clearly set forth in the claims or specification. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claims not specifically referred to above are rejected due to their dependence on a rejected base claim.

13. Claims 17-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: decrypting the intermediate

results set. Claims 17 and 31 each recite encrypting data in line 3, and each recite re-encrypting data in line 11; however, there is never a step of decryption performed. It is noted that the decryption recited in dependent Claims 18 and 32 does not clearly remedy this omission because another step of re-encrypting is also recited in those claims, and it is not clear whether the steps of Claims 18 and 32 would be performed before or after the re-encryption in line 11 of Claims 17 and 31.

Examiner's Note

14. Because the claims are rendered indefinite by the several issues detailed above in reference to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the claims are not enabled as detailed in reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and the majority of the claims are also directed to non-statutory subject matter as described above in reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, it has not been possible to determine the scope of the claims, and therefore it has not been possible to fully search the prior art for the claimed subject matter in order to make a determination regarding the patentability of the claims with respect to novelty under 35 U.S.C. 102 and non-obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. The claims have been interpreted to the extent possible in light of the issues of indefiniteness, lack of enablement, and non-statutory subject matter. A search has been made to the extent possible, and documents that appear to be relevant are cited below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

16. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hacigumus et al, "Executing SQL over Encrypted Data in the Database-Service-Provider Model" (cited by Applicant).

In reference to Claims 1-14, Hacigumus discloses a system that includes client and server computers and a network connecting them (see page 217, Figure 1), in which data from the client computer is encrypted by the client and hosted by the server, the encrypted data is operated on by the server to produce intermediate results, which are sent from the server to the client where the intermediate results are further operated on, sent back to the server for further operation, and sent back to the client again to produce a result (page 226, section 7, conclusion; pages 223-224, section 5, for example, where encrypted data tuples are sent back and forth twice between the server and the client, and remain encrypted while being processed at the server).

Claims 15 and 16 are directed to systems corresponding substantially to the system of Claim 1, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claims 17-30 are directed to methods corresponding to the functions of the systems of Claims 1-14, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claims 31-44 are directed to software implementations of the methods of Claims 17-30, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Goldstein, US Patent 5963642, discloses a database encryption mechanism having secure storage of semantically encrypted data.
- b. Lirov et al, US Patent 6785810, discloses a system for storing encrypted database records where sensitive data remains encrypted.
- c. Rice et al, US Patent 6957341, discloses a system in which computations are securely outsourced to a computing center and are disguised in transport.
- d. Nishizawa et al, US Patent 7228416, discloses a system in which contents of database queries are encrypted.
- e. Newman et al, US Patent 7266699, discloses a system for encrypting a database.
- f. Agarwal et al, European Patent Application EP 0855656 discloses a system for optimizing a query processing tree in a relational database.

18. This Office action has an attached requirement for information under 37 CFR

1.105. A complete reply to this Office action must include a complete reply to the

attached requirement for information. The time period for reply to the attached requirement coincides with the time period for reply to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A. Davis whose telephone number is (571)272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ZAD/
Examiner, Art Unit 2137

Art Unit: 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137

Requirement for Information under 37 CFR 1.105

Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application.

In response to this requirement, please **provide answers** to each of the following interrogatories eliciting factual information:

In general, where in the parent application (Serial No. 10/449,421) is support found for the claim limitations, particularly those of the independent claims? More specifically, where is support (i.e. enabling written description as per 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph) in the parent application found for the limitations in independent Claim 1 regarding returning intermediate results to the server computer and sending the intermediate results back again to the client computer, and the more detailed related limitations of dependent Claim 2? Similarly, where is support in the parent application found for the corresponding limitations of independent Claims 15 and 16? Where is support in the parent application found for corresponding limitations in independent Claims 17 and 31 regarding re-encrypting updated intermediate results and transferring the re-encrypted intermediate results to the server and transferring the new intermediate results back to the client, and the more detailed related limitations of dependent Claims 18 and 32?

Further in response to this requirement, please **provide copies** of each publication which any of the applicants authored or co-authored and which describe the disclosed subject matter of the present application.

In responding to those requirements that require copies of documents, where the document is a bound text or a single article over 50 pages, the requirement may be met by providing copies of those pages that provide the particular subject matter indicated in the requirement, or where such subject matter is not indicated, the subject matter found in applicant's disclosure.

The fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR 1.97 are waived for those documents submitted in reply to this requirement. This waiver extends only to those documents within the scope of this requirement under 37 CFR 1.105 that are included in the applicant's first complete communication responding to this requirement. Any supplemental replies subsequent to the first communication responding to this requirement and any information disclosures beyond the scope of this requirement under 37 CFR 1.105 are subject to the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR 1.97.

The applicant is reminded that the reply to this requirement must be made with candor and good faith under 37 CFR 1.56. Where the applicant does not have or cannot readily obtain an item of required information, a statement that the item is unknown or cannot be readily obtained may be accepted as a complete reply to the requirement for that item.

Art Unit: 2137

This requirement is an attachment of the enclosed Office action. A complete reply to the enclosed Office action must include a complete reply to this requirement. The time period for reply to this requirement coincides with the time period for reply to the enclosed Office action.

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137